





1000

[illegible][illegible]

much abundant in the Dartford Downs country. I said to me, I found that the fossils were older, though some I first examined had a Cretaceous look.

When I went to the Dartford Downs, I was told that I should then be seen by Professor McCoy. Because of it and turn out that they were Jurassic, it would be necessary to see what was the evidence respecting the coal. I was very kindly accompanied by Mr. McCoy, who was a Henry very kindly accompanied by Mr. McCoy, who was a Cretaceous as kindly examined them, reporting to me that I had seen them Lower Mesozoic, and "not younger than the base of the Great Oolite of the Dartford Downs." In short, he considered them as Marine.

When I returned to the Dartford Downs, I found that the fossil plants in our coal beds. Those several which, as I have said, made me think of the Cretaceous fossils of the Dartford Downs, I examined one of the Trise, and there others were comparing them with figures of fossils of the Great Oolite of the Dartford Downs. I found that the fossils of the Dartford Downs and Lyett's mesozoic, imply simply that they are of the same age. But the Dartford Downs fossils are of the same age as the Dartford Downs fossils. I do not know what Professor McCoy has made of them.

more likely to be representative of the whole than of a single locality. Fitzroy Downs equivalent with the Wianamatta Series in the county of Cumberland than anything else. The rocks have been found at the junction of the Coast Range with the Mackenzie, being made up of the same volcanic plugs, and coal occurs within 100 miles to the westward, yet the whole of the facts, so far as I have been able to ascertain, will make it probable that these fossils come from a formation older than the Coal-field. Assuming that they could be Triassic, there are many circumstances which would justify the assumption. However, even if they were of the same age as the proper position by paleontological evidence would demand should it appear that they are really Jurassic, they will still be reconciled to the assumption of an older epoch.

On looking over the map of the Marmonas, in Mitchell's geological Australia, I find the word "Bolemitic" marked on Mount Abundance. I never saw any such fossil in the Marmonas section, nor in any of the sections of the Thames, and as he always referred to English geologists for descriptions of rocks and fossils, I was anxious when I first saw the map to find out what the word indicated. "Bolemitic", or whether an *Oribolites* fossil.

we have been found. Sir Thomas told me he did not know more than that the collection he had made were sent to the British Museum, and that he had been told the may be the fossils or rocks from the various localities. Accordingly wrote first to the late Dean of Westminster, and Buckland; and afterwards to Professor Owen, who was then at the British Museum. Both of these gentlemen told me that they had been informed by their friend Sir James Smith that he might be informed whether he had found the Belemnite or not. From that time to this I have never received the information that either of these gentlemen had seen the specimens from Wollumbilla. I have been told that the indication might be correct. I have now requested Mr. Gordon to institute, at my request, a search, not only among the Belemnites, but also among the Mount Sowerby, to the N.W., where Mr. Gordon and fossils which were not described or examined, and within a few miles of which fragments of coral were found. After Christmas I will be able to ascertain the position of the country at the head of the Maracora. In the interim, I can only endeavour to ascertain the proper geological position of the Wollumbilla fossils.

fish-like of *Paramania*, *Campbelliella*, and *Bol* Band of *Rastrellia*, should those beds be determined here as Permian, it would establish that epoch very far to the west, and in this case, the *Trisatic* would have to stand or fall on its own credentials. That provision is not, however, known in Australia.

In Dr. J. A. Rees' collection of *Trisatic* specimens, in the name of Nelson, in New Zealand, is a sandstone containing *Avicula*, *Spirifer*, *Terebratulina*, *Mytilus*, and *Trisatic* (of which genus I have here a specimen, given to me by the writer) which he has determined to be of the Muschelkalk, or Middle Triassic. Rees:—(No. 26).

And here, it is another argument in favour of the position of the *Trisatic* being represented in Australia. The *Trisatic* of New Zealand is certainly not the same as the *Trisatic* of the Permian, as the *Trisatic* shells also occur in the Wollumbia collection.

That it exists in Australia has been demonstrated. It is a short, cone to the top, with a small, rounded, and by him to abound in rocks which are physically represented by the Permian, as named by Sir R. Archibuch, because the district of Perm in Russia was and by him to abound in rocks which are physically represented by the Permian, as named by Sir R. Archibuch, because the district of Perm in Russia was

Many geologists do not believe in the necessity of a Pteranodon, and speak only of the Magnesian Hymenoptera (No. 10). But it has been asserted that it will be found to be of great utility to us. And that there are indications of its existence in Australia; and also from Product from the neighbourhood of Mantarie Downs, in the north of the colony. It is also found in the neighbourhood of Fitzroy Downs; and also from other localities.

In a few weeks ago an announcement was made in the Sydney papers, that two or three Pteranodon remains had been discovered in the neighbourhood of Mantarie Downs, and that had them in charge at Brisbane; and they were very considerably forwarded to me for examination. The Fish and Game Commission had been informed that the Pteranodon remains were missing, but those were portions of the skeleton of a genus of the Pteranodon family (Pteranodon), and the other fossils were Product, much of the Pteranodon Downs. I consider them, therefore, either Permian or Carboniferous.

I have also received from the colony fishes which appear also to be allied to Permian fishes; these will be mentioned hereafter by Sir Philip Greville, Bart, who is

It has lately been found in Canada, under the species

*U. dentatella*. It was formerly called *U. propinqua*, named by Frederick H. Hall in 1858, and was described by Lowe in 1860. In 1859, Mr. Salter described it in the first volume of the Geological Survey of Canada, printed at Montreal, and immediately under it, among the names of *U. dentatella*, which was communicated to myself, and was originally named after me. The name of *U. dentatella* was changed, to show the distinction more clearly between it and *U. propinqua*, a more clearly defined species from the Upper Silurian of the Permian, which I published in 1860, with information on the Murremberg; but it is there associated with other Silurian genera, with some akin to Devonian, and others to Carboniferous and Permian genera. I found one the other day among Mr. Koenig's collections illustrating the coal beds; but he received it from me one who found it not far from Murremberg. Unfortunately, we have got as far down in the table as the Upper Silurian. *U. dentatella* is quite as well developed in some parts of the Permian rocks of the Murremberg as the Upper Silurian, and forms the great mass of the productive

country around Mount Alexander in Victoria.



u/nla.news-page14839











the  
ious  
sum-  
day  
g in  
n of  
they  
dis-  
was  
and  
con-  
the  
far-  
job,  
wood

the  
ne;  
said,  
with  
tra-  
pre-  
very  
dur-  
est,  
amu  
er,  
at,  
that  
he,  
pity  
; on  
ion.  
tant  
birds  
name  
the











